REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of July 27, 2007 all claims are rejected. With this response claim 1 is amended to correct informalities. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

Claim Objections

In section 3, on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 is objected to due to informalities. Claim 1 is amended to remove the word "for," as suggested by the Office in order to correct the grammatical informalities. Applicant acknowledges that this amendment is submitted after a final rejection, but respectfully requests consideration and entry of the amendment. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment does not affect the scope of the claims, and will require no additional search of substantive examination on the part of the Office. The amendment is only for the purposes of correcting a grammatical error. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment.

Claim Rejections Under § 112

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office asserts that the limitation recited in the independent claims of "using the combined information for selecting a time of access to at least one of the at least two peripheral devices after completion of an initialization of each of said at least two peripheral devices," is not supported in the originally filed specification. Applicant respectfully submits that the limitation recited in the independent claims is described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention recited in the claims.

Claim 1 recites three different time-related aspects. The first is the individual initialization time of each of the peripheral devices, i.e. an individual timeout value for each device could represent the time which is required at the most by this device for its initialization. The second is a common timeout value for all peripheral devices, i.e. combined information indicating a time which is required at the most by any of the at least two peripheral devices for

its respective initialization as recited in claim 1. The third time-related aspect is a time selected for the actual access to one of the peripheral devices after all considered peripheral devices have been initialized.

In the system of Figure 5, it is disclosed that several peripheral devices (20, 30, 40) have their own initialization times. See specification page 18, line 16—page 19, line 8. Once the common timeout value has been determined for the system of Figure 5 with several peripheral devices, further operation corresponds to the details of the operation in the system of Figure 1 described with reference to Figure 4. See specification page 20, lines 8-11.

Figures 1 and 4 describe a system using a single peripheral device. Therefore, one of skill in the art would understand that as soon as the common timeout value has been determined, the process of Figure 4 may be used individually for each peripheral device based on the determined common timeout value instead of the individual timeout value.

The specification on page 17, lines 4-34 describes, by way of example, a polling method for selecting the time of access based on an available timeout value. It is specifically stated that the "timeout value received…is used by the MMC controller 12 to set a polling frequency." Page 19, lines 1-8 clarify that for the system of Figure 5 the maximum timeout value, and therefore the common timeout value, is used as the basis for selecting the polling frequency. The specification discloses that the MMC controller 12 carries out a polling with the set polling frequency for determining when the MultiMediaCard 20 is ready for actual operation. See page 17, lines 12-14. When a polling process has been completed, the process is then continued as known from the state of the art. See specification page 18, lines 1-2.

A peripheral device has to be powered up and initialized before it is able to offer its functions to a host device, and the host device has to know when the peripheral device is in a ready state, before the host device can start to make use of the peripheral device, i.e. before it can select a time of access of the device, as recited in the independent claims. See specification page 1, lines 25-32. Therefore, the specification discloses to one of skill in the art how to make and use the invention as claimed. As such, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under § 112, first paragraph.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges that in section 5, on page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 are indicated to be allowable. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the reasons discussed above, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 comply with the enablement requirement and are allowable.

Conclusion

The objections and rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal thereof. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiencies required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 27 August 2007

/Keith R. Obert/
Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No: 004955